

Appl. No. 09/808,500
Arndt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13472-US1
EUS/J/P/04-2111

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 10 and 19 have been amended and claims 17 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 10-16, 18-25 and 27 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 10-13, 15-16, 18-22, 24-25 and 27 as being unpatentable over Hillis (US 5,303,297) in view of Raith (US 6,493,547); and claims 14, 17, 23 and 26 as being unpatentable over Hillis in view of Raith and further in view of Deakin (US 6,462,275). The Applicant has amended claims 10 and 19 to include limitations from claims 17 and 26, respectively, and has cancelled claims 17 and 26. The Applicant will, therefore, address the Examiner's rejection of claims 17 and 26 as applicable to claims 10 and 19, as amended.

Claim 10 recites:

10. A method of monitoring the chargeable activities of a user in a mobile telecommunications network, the method comprising the steps of:

monitoring at least a first condition (C1) and a second condition (C2) on which charging is based;

normalizing said first condition against a first normalizing value (N1) and said second condition against a second normalizing value (N2), said step of normalizing comprising dividing the value of said condition by said normalizing value to yield normalized conditions;

adding said first (C1/N1) and second (C2/N2) normalized conditions to yield a total consumed charging units value; and

comparing said total consumed charging units value against a charging unit authorization limit; and

wherein said user is a subscriber of a home network and is roaming in a foreign network, and wherein the first and second normalizing values are transferred from the home network to the serving node of the foreign network using the Customized Applications for Mobile Network Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) protocol. (emphasis added)

Appl. No. 09/808,500
Andt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13472-US1
EUS/JP/04-2111

The Applicant's invention solves several problems, including i) charging based on two or more conditions, such as voice minutes and bytes of data transmission, and ii) different rates of charging between home and visited networks. The Applicant's invention accomplishes both objectives by monitoring at least a first condition (C1) and a second condition (C2) on which charging is based; the conditions can be associated with, for example, voice call minutes and bytes of data transmission. The first and second conditions are normalized by dividing the value of each condition by a normalizing value (see details at pages 6-7 of the specification). The normalized conditions are then added to yield a total consumed charging units value, which is then compared to a charging unit authorization limit. In particular, the Applicant's invention provides for such charging when a subscriber of a home network and is roaming in a foreign network, by transferring normalizing values from the home network to the serving node of the foreign network.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Hillis does not [specify]¹ the user is a subscriber of a home GSM network and is roaming in a foreign GSM network, and the normalizing values are transferred from the home network to the serving node of the foreign network using the Customized Applications for Mobile Network Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) protocol." (emphasis added) In order to overcome the deficiencies of Hillis, the Examiner has looked to the teachings of Deakin. Deakin, however, also fails to disclose the claimed limitation. Although Deakin does discuss the use of the CAMEL protocol, it fails to disclose transferring normalizing values from a home network to the serving node of a foreign network when a subscriber of the home network and is roaming in the foreign network. Furthermore, the teachings of Deakin, either alone or in combination with Hillis and Raith, fails to disclose, much less suggest, monitoring at least two conditions, normalizing those two conditions, adding the normalized values to obtain a total consumed charging units value, and comparing the total consumed charging units value against a charging unit authorization limit, wherein a user is a subscriber of a home network and is roaming in a foreign network, and wherein the normalizing values

¹ The Applicant has substituted the word "specify" for the phrase "specifically the home network" contained in the Office Action, which appears to be a typographical error by the Examiner.

Appl. No. 09/808,500
Amtd. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13472-US1
EUS/JP/04-2111

are transferred from the home network to the serving node of the foreign network using the Customized Applications for Mobile Network Enhanced Logic (CAMEL) protocol.
Therefore, claim 10 is not obvious over Hillis in view of Raith and Deakin.
Whereas claim 19 includes limitations analogous to those of claim 10, claim 19 is also not obvious over Hillis in view of Raith and Deakin. Furthermore, whereas claims 11-16 and 18 are dependent from claim 10, and claims 20-25 and 27 are dependent from claim 19, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also not obvious in view of those references.

Appl. No. 09/808,500
Amtd. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13472-US1
EUS/J/P/04-2111

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 10-16, 18-25 and 27.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: September 15, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com